



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/070,221	08/19/2002	Sunao Takatori	2222.6090001	9612
26111	7590	05/11/2011		
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.			EXAMINER	
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			LE, CANH	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2439	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/11/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/070,221	TAKATORI ET AL.	
	Examiner CANH LE	Art Unit 2439	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2011.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 11-13, 15-19, 21-27 and 31 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 11-13, 15-19, 21-27, and 31 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/24/2011 has been entered.

This Office Action is in response to the application 10/070221 filed on 03/24/2011.

Claims 1-10, 14, 20, and 28-30 have been cancelled.

Claims 11, 17, 18, 21, and 31 have been amended.

Claims 11-13, 15-19, 21-27, and 31 have been examined and are pending.

This Action is made Non-FINAL.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see pages 10-11, filed 03/24/2011, with respect to the objection of claim 18 have been fully considered. The objection of claim 18 has been withdrawn due to amended claim.

Applicant's arguments, see pages 11-12, filed 03/24/2011, with respect to the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of claim 21 have been fully considered. The 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of claim 21 has been withdrawn due to amended claim.

Applicant's arguments, see pages 12-13, filed 03/24/2011, with respect to the objection of the specification have been fully considered. The objection of the specification withdrawn due to amended claim.

To clarify the limitations in the amended claims 11, 17, 18, and 21, the telephone interview was initiated with Mr. Randall K. Baldwin on Wednesday 20 and Thursday 21, 2011.

Mr. Randall K. Baldwin agreed to amend the claims 11, 17, 18, and 21 as the following:

(Claim 11, line 9): "the price is greater than or equal to" should be replaced by "the price is above first threshold amount and is less than or equal to".

(Claim 11, line 11): "greater than" should be replaced by "less than".

(Claim 17, lines 10-11): "the price is greater than or equal to" should be replaced by "the price is above first threshold amount and is less than or equal to".

(Claim 17, line 12): "greater than" should be replaced by "less than".

(Claims 18, lines 18-20): "the numeric value is greater than or equal to" should be replaced by "the numeric value is above first threshold amount and is less than or equal to"

(Claims 18, lines 19-20): "greater than" should be replaced by "less than".

(Claim 21, line 11): "the price is greater than or equal to" should be replaced by "the price is above first threshold amount and is less than or equal to".

(Claim 21, line 1): "greater than" should be replaced by "less than".

The Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 11-13, 15-19, 21-27, and 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11, 17, 21, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2000-76336 (hereinafter **Taro) in view of US Patent 6,516,056 B1 (hereinafter **Justice**), further in view of US Patent Application Publication 2001/0001877 A1 (hereinafter **French**).**

As per claim 11:

Taro teaches a method, comprising:

(a) a receiving a first request, from a service device, for information regarding authentication of a user [Taro: par. [0024], “**The electronic banking authorization system 1-7 receives each authentication request demand from two or more Electronic Commerce Technology Division service provider equipment 1-6. It has the function to perform authentication for electronic banking alone about a user, and functions as an authentication center intensively prepared to two or more Electronic Commerce**

Technology Division service providers” Electronic Commerce Technology Division service provider is known as a service device];

Taro does not explicitly discloses,

“(b) authenticating the user for the transaction before completing the transaction in response to determining that the price is below a first threshold amount, which corresponds to a first authentication level; and

(c) authenticating the user for the transaction **after** completing the transaction in response to determining that the price is above first threshold amount and is less than or equal to a second threshold amount, which corresponds to a second authentication level, wherein the first threshold amount is less than the second threshold amount.”

However, Justice discloses fraud prevention system and method. In one embodiment, Justice teaches an accessed risk level is less than the fraud queue threshold (*i.e. a first predetermined threshold*) which corresponds to a first authentication level [Justice: **fig. 4: Col. 9, lines 24-31**], request authorization, request address verification, and fulfill order [Justice: **fig. 4: Col. 9, line 41 to Col. 10, line 57**]. Justice further teaches an accessed risk level exceeds a first determined threshold which corresponds to a second authentication level and an order may be verified by fraud clerk [Justice: **fig. 4: Col. 9, lines 24-31; Col. 11, lines 1-14, lines 60-65**].

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method and system of Taro and Justice by implementing *“authenticating the user for the transaction before completing the transaction in response to determining that the price is below a first threshold amount*, which corresponds to a first authentication level, *and authenticating the user for the transaction after completing the*

transaction in response to determining that the price is above first threshold amount which corresponds to a second authentication level”

The motivation is to provide a system and method for inhibiting fraud in card-not-present transactions as suggested by Justice [Justice: Col. 1, line 40 to Col. 2, line 20].

Justice does not explicitly disclose “*a second threshold amount, determining that the price is less than or equal to a second threshold amount, wherein the first threshold amount is less than the second threshold amount*”. However, French teaches a system and method for authentication of network users with preprocessing. In one embodiment, French discloses three or more levels of authentication (i.e. having more than one threshold) performing additional checks using databases or prompting the user for more information, when appropriate to transaction requirements [French: par. [0157]].

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method and system of Taro and Justice by including the teaching of French to provide an authentication system and method that generate a score indicating the confidence or certainty level of authentication [French, par. [0017]].

As per claim 17:

This claim has limitations that are similar to those of claim 11, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 11 above.

As per claim 21:

This claim has limitations that are similar to those of claim 11, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 11 above.

As per claim 31:

The combination of Taro, Justice, and French further teaches the method of claim 11, further comprising:

- (a) wherein the second authentication level comprises authenticating the user after receiving a first confirmation from the user **[French: [0024-0027]; The interactive query might ask the user for lender's name or payment amount...]; and**
- (b) wherein a third authentication level occurs in response to determining that the price is above the second threshold and the third authentication level **[Justice: fig. 4: Col. 9, lines 24-31; Col. 11, lines 1-14, lines 60-65; Gupta: fig. 7; Col. 8, lines 55-65; a second threshold value greater than T2, "ALLOW" entry is placed in the screening filter stored in the database; French: par. [0157]]** comprises authenticating the user after, receiving the first confirmation from the user **[French: [0024-0027]; The interactive query might ask the user for lender's name or payment amount...]** and a second confirmation from the service device **[French: par. [0022]; enabling different levels of authentication to be performed based on the level of security desired; par. [0157]; "Although illustrated with two levels of authentication processing, it will be understood that the invention contemplates three or more levels of authentication performing additional databases or prompting the user for more information, when appropriate to transaction requirement.."]**.

Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2000-92236 (hereinafter **Shuichi**) in view of JP 2000-76336 (hereinafter **Taro**), further in view of US Patent 6,516,056 B1 (hereinafter **Justice**) and further in view of US Patent Application Publication 2001/0001877 A1 (hereinafter **French**).

As per claim 18:

Shunichi teaches a communications device, comprising:

- (a) a receiver operable to receive, from a host computer, a request for information regarding authentication of a user [Shunichi : par. [003]; **“the provider of whom connection was required demands transmission of a user ID from a communication terminal first. A communication terminal transmits a user ID to a provider to the demand”**];
- (b) a storage device operable to store information regarding the authentication of the user [Shunichi : par. [003]; **“A communication terminal transmits a user ID to a provider to the demand”**; **It is inherent that communication terminal stores user ID in a memory before transmitting user ID to a provider**]; and
- (c) a transmitter operable to transmit information regarding the authentication of the user [Shunichi : par. [006]-[007]; **“Moreover, invention according to claim 9 data in the information service equipment which transmits through a communication line to the attested communication terminal connection request from said communication terminal. It is characterized by having a terminal specific information receiving means to receive the terminal specific information which specifies the communication terminal concerned, and**

the authentication means which attests whether said connection request is recognized based on said terminal specific information which received”],

(d) wherein the communications device is a mobile communications device [Shunichi : fig. 1, box 100; par. [0010], **cellular phone and land mobile radiotelephone**],

Shunichi does not explicitly teach a request for information regarding authentication of a user at service device, wherein the request is in response to a transaction at the service device.

However, Taro teaches teach a request for information regarding authentication of a user at service device, wherein the request is in response to a transaction at the service device [Taro: par. [0024], “**The electronic banking authorization system 1-7 receives each authentication request demand from two or more Electronic Commerce Technology Division service provider equipment 1-6. It has the function to perform authentication for electronic banking alone about a user, and functions as an authentication center intensively prepared to two or more Electronic Commerce Technology Division service providers**”; **Electronic Commerce Technology Division service provider is known as a service device**].

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the communication device of Shunichi by including the teaching of Taro to provide users with a means for performing banking authentication while preventing leaking of secrecy information [Taro: par. 0011].

Taro does not explicitly disclose,

“wherein the request for information is received before the transaction has completed when a first one of a plurality of independent authentication levels is used for the transaction in response to determining that the numeric value is below a first threshold amount, and

wherein the request for information is received after the transaction has completed when a second one of the plurality of independent authentication levels is used for the transaction in response to determining that the numeric value is above first threshold amount and is less than or equal to a second threshold amount, wherein the first threshold amount is less than the second threshold amount”

However, Justice discloses fraud prevention system and method. In one embodiment, Justice teaches an accessed risk level is less than the fraud queue threshold (*i.e. a first predetermined threshold*) which corresponds to a first authentication level [**Justice: fig. 4: Col. 9, lines 24-31**], request authorization, request address verification, and fulfill order [**Justice: fig. 4: Col. 9, line 41 to Col. 10, line 57**]. Justice further teaches an accessed risk level exceeds a first determined threshold which corresponds to a second authentication level and an order may be verified by fraud clerk [**Justice: fig. 4: Col. 9, lines 24-31; Col. 11, lines 1-14, lines 60-65**].

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method and system of Shunichi, Tara, and Justice by implementing *“wherein the request for information is received before the transaction has completed when a first one of a plurality of independent authentication levels is used for the transaction in response to determining that the numeric value is below a first threshold amount, and wherein the request for information is received after the transaction has completed when a second one of the plurality of independent authentication levels is used for the transaction in response to determining that the numeric value is above first threshold amount”*

The motivation is to provide a system and method for inhibiting fraud in card-not-present transactions as suggested by Justice [**Justice: Col. 1, line 40 to Col. 2, line 20**].

Justice does not explicitly disclose “*a second threshold amount, determining that the price is less than or equal to a second threshold amount, wherein the first threshold amount is less than the second threshold amount*”. However, French teaches a system and method for authentication of network users with preprocessing. In one embodiment, French discloses three or more levels of authentication (i.e. having more than one threshold) performing additional checks using databases or prompting the user for more information, when appropriate to transaction requirements [French: par. [0157]].

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method and system of Shunichi, Tara, and Justice by including the teaching of French to provide an authentication system and method that generate a score indicating the confidence or certainty level of authentication [French, par. [0017]].

As per claim 19:

The combination of Shunichi, Tara, Justice, and French further teaches the communications device of claim 18, wherein the transmitter is further operable to selectively transmit, to the host computer, information regarding the authentication of the user based on a type of authentication requested [Shunichi : par. [003]; “**A provider will demand transmission of a password from a communication terminal next, if a user ID checks that it is regular ID. A communication terminal transmits a password to the demand. And a provider performs user authentication by distinguishing whether the transmitted password is a password corresponding to the user ID transmitted previously”**].

Claims 12 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2000-76336 (hereinafter **Taro**) in view of US Patent 6,516,056 B1 (hereinafter **Justice**), further in view of US Patent Application Publication 2001/0001877 A1 (hereinafter **French**), and further in view of JP 2000-92236 (hereinafter **Shuichi**).

As per claim 22:

The combination of Taro, Justice, and French teaches the subject matter as described above. Taro further teaches the method of claim 11, wherein the authenticating comprises:

- (a) transmitting to a device a second request for user identification information in response to receiving the first request [Taro: par. [0012]; “**A means to ***** a user terminal through a public network based on this user identifier, and to receive the secrecy information of the user for electronic banking directly through this public network from a user terminal**”];
- (b) receiving the user identification information from a user communications device [Taro: par. [0012]; “**A means to ***** a user terminal through a public network based on this user identifier, and to receive the secrecy information of the user for electronic banking directly through this public network from a user terminal**”];
- (c) comparing the user identification information and authentication information to generate comparison results [Taro: par. [0078]; “**Furthermore, in order that an electronic banking authorization system may perform his identification by calling back the Electronic Commerce Technology Division service user based on the subscriber information memorized by the database storage section, the Electronic Commerce Technology Division**

service provider side and the user side -- him -- necessity of the special authentication equipment for identification cannot be carried out, but simple composition can perform his identification, and trouble generating of an unjust claim of the charge by a user's malpractice etc. can be prevented"]; and

(d) using the comparison result for the authentication [**Taro: par. [0078]**].

Taro, Justice, and French do not explicitly teach a user terminal as a mobile communication device.

However, Shuichi teaches a mobile communication device which transmits a user ID to a host communications devices to a demand [**Shuichi: par. [003]**; “**A communication terminal transmits a user ID to a provider to the demand. A provider will demand transmission of a password from a communication terminal next, if a user ID checks that it is regular ID. A communication terminal transmits a password to the demand. And a provider performs user authentication by distinguishing whether the transmitted password is a password corresponding to the user ID transmitted previously”**; fig. 1, a communication terminal is a mobile device 100].

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Taro, Justice, and French by including the teaching of Shunichi to provide users with a means for safely and effectively performing authentication between a registered user and a service provider [**Shuichi: abstract and par. [0003]**].

As per claim 12:

The combination of Taro, Justice, French, and Shuichi teaches the subject matter as described above.

Shunichi further teaches the method of claim 22, wherein identification information of the user includes personal attributes of the user [Shuichi: par. [003]; “**A communication terminal transmits a user ID to a provider to the demand. A provider will demand transmission of a password from a communication terminal next, if a user ID checks that it is regular ID. A communication terminal transmits a password to the demand. And a provider performs user authentication by distinguishing whether the transmitted password is a password corresponding to the user ID transmitted previously”**; fig. 1, a communication terminal is a mobile device 100].

As per claim 23:

This claim has limitations that are similar to those of claim 22, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 22 above.

As per claim 24:

This claim has limitations that are similar to those of claim 12, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 12 above.

Claims 15-16 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2000-76336 (hereinafter **Taro**) in view of US Patent 6,516,056 B1 (hereinafter **Justice**), further in

view of US Patent Application Publication 2001/0001877 A1 (hereinafter **French**), and further in view of JP 06-215009 (hereinafter **Shunichi**).

As per claim 15:

The combination of Taro, Justice, and French teaches the subject matter as described in claim 11.

Taro, Justice, and French do not explicitly teach wherein the determining further comprises:

(a) comparing the parameter of the transaction with a parameter of a past transaction provided.

However, Shunichi teaches comparing the parameter of the transaction with a parameter of a past transaction provided [Shunichi: par. [005]]; “**The purpose of this invention memorizes cumulatively the amount of money for purchase in a unit period for every card number of each card issuer. When the amount of money for purchase memorized about the credit card shown at the time of processing of transactions exceeds the purchase limit set up beforehand, it is in offering the card processing system which can prevent that buy it and unjust dealings of the large sums by the surroundings are performed by transmitting that to a card issuer”**].

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Taro, Justice, and French by including the teaching of Shunichi to provide a credit card transaction processing having capability of dealing with unjust dealings and exceeding the purchase limit [Shunichi: par. [005]].

As per claim 16:

The combination of Taro, Justice, French, and Shunichi teaches the subject matter as described above.

Shunichi further teaches a card processing system wherein the parameter is the price of service, services provision area, service provision frequency, or total sum of money for the services provided [Shunichi: claim 1, claim 2; par. [005]; “**The purpose of this invention memorizes cumulatively the amount of money for purchase in a unit period for every card number of each card issuer. When the amount of money for purchase memorized about the credit card shown at the time of processing of transactions exceeds the purchase limit set up beforehand, it is in offering the card processing system which can prevent that buy it and unjust dealings of the large sums by the surroundings are performed by transmitting that to a card issuer”**].

As per claim 27:

This claim has limitations that are similar to those of claim 15, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 15 above.

Claims 13 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2000-76336 (hereinafter **Taro**) in view of US Patent 6,516,056 B1 (hereinafter **Justice**), further in view of US Patent Application Publication 2001/0001877 A1 (hereinafter **French**), further in

view of JP 2000-92236 (hereinafter **Shuichi**), and further in view JP 06-215009 (hereinafter **Shunichi**).

As per claim 13:

The combination of Taro, Justice, French, and Shunichi teaches the subject matter as described in claim 22.

Taro, Justice, French, and Shunichi do not explicitly teach receiving from the service device information regarding current products or services provided.

However, Shunichi teaches receiving from the service device information regarding current products or services provided [Shunichi: par. [005]; **“The purpose of this invention memorizes cumulatively the amount of money for purchase in a unit period for every card number of each card issuer. When the amount of money for purchase memorized about the credit card shown at the time of processing of transactions exceeds the purchase limit set up beforehand, it is in offering the card processing system which can prevent that buy it and unjust dealings of the large sums by the surroundings are performed by transmitting that to a card issuer”**].

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Taro, Justice, French, and Shunichi of the invention by including the step of Shunichi to provide a credit card transaction processing having capability of dealing with unjust dealings and exceeding the purchase limit [Shunichi: par. [005]].

As per claim 25:

This claim has limitations that are similar to those of claim 13, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 13 above.

As per claim 26:

The combination of Taro, Justice, French, and Shunichi teaches the subject matter as described above.

Taro, Justice, French, and Shunichi do not explicitly teach wherein a parameter of the transaction is the price of service, services provision area, service provision frequency, or total sum of money for the services provided.

However, Shunichi teaches a card processing system wherein a parameter of the transaction is the price of service, services provision area, service provision frequency, or total sum of money for the services provided [Shunichi: claim 1, claim 2; par. [005]; **“The purpose of this invention memorizes cumulatively the amount of money for purchase in a unit period for every card number of each card issuer. When the amount of money for purchase memorized about the credit card shown at the time of processing of transactions exceeds the purchase limit set up beforehand, it is in offering the card processing system which can prevent that buy it and unjust dealings of the large sums by the surroundings are performed by transmitting that to a card issuer”**].

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Taro, Justice, French, and Shunichi by including

the teaching of Shunichi to provide a credit card transaction processing having capability of dealing with unjust dealings and exceeding the purchase limit [Shunichi: par. [005]].

Examiner's Note

Examiner has cited particular paragraphs or columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner. In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Canh Le whose telephone number is 571-270-1380. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7:30AM to 5:00PM other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Orgad Edan can be reached on 571-272-7884. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Canh Le/

Examiner, Art Unit 2439

May 4, 2011

/Yin-Chen Shaw/
Examiner, Art Unit 2439